

REMARKS

The last Office Action in the above-identified application and the comments of the Examiner have been carefully considered. The claims have been amended in a sincere effort to define more clearly features of Applicants' invention.

The allowance of Claim 18 and the probable allowance of Claim 17 are acknowledged and gratefully appreciated. Claim 17 has been rejected on formal grounds, as noted in paragraph 3 of the Office Action, with respect to the lack of proper antecedent basis for the limitation "the further conductive film". It is noted that, in paragraph 6 of the Office Action, the Examiner indicated that Claim 17 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112.

The courtesy of the Examiner in pointing this lack of antecedent basis out is acknowledged and appreciated. Claim 17 has been, accordingly, amended to positively recite the further conductive film at line 8 of the claim, so that this recitation now provides proper antecedent basis for the same terminology used later in the claim.


It is respectively urged that Claim 17, as amended, overcomes the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112 and is now in proper form for allowance.

Claims 1 through 6, 8 through 13, 15 and 16 have again been rejected in view of the references cited by the Examiner. In order to place this application in proper form for allowance, these claims have been cancelled.

The undersigned attorney wishes to thank Examiner Lee for the courtesy he extended to the Applicant throughout the prosecution of this application.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, favorable reconsideration of amended Claim 17 and allowance of the application with Claims 17 and 18 are respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Gerald T. Bodner
Gerald T. Bodner
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 30,449

BODNER & O'ROURKE, LLP
425 Broadhollow Road, Suite 108
Melville, NY 11747
Telephone: (631) 249-7500
Facsimile: (631) 249-4508

GTB:mff